

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 12-14 are now present in the application. Claims 1 and 9 are independent. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Reasons for Entry of Amendments

At the outset, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered into the Official File in view of the fact that the amendments to the claims automatically place the application in condition for allowance.

In the alternative, if the Examiner does not agree that this application is in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered for the purpose of appeal. This Amendment reduces the issues on appeal by identifying features that distinguish the Applicants' claimed invention from the prior art of record. This Amendment was not presented at an earlier date in view of the fact that Applicants did not fully appreciate the Examiner's position until the Final Office Action was reviewed.

Drawings

Applicants have **still** not received a Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review PTO-948 or other indication of whether or not the formal drawings have

been approved by the Draftsperson. Since no objection has been received, Applicants assume that the drawings are acceptable and that no further action is necessary. Confirmation thereof in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2 and 4-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,331,884 to Masazumi et al. (Masazumi) in view of Gyoda and claims 9, 10 and 12-14 stand rejected over Gyoda in view of Masazumi and Hashimoto. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejection are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection based on Masazumi has been obviated and/or rendered moot. While not conceding to the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to expedite prosecution, as the Examiner will note, independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to recite combinations of elements including adjusting an on-off of a voltage according to a position of the moving substrate and an on-off of a voltage applied to said apparatus is adjusted according to a position of the moving substrate, respectively. Applicants respectfully submit that these combinations of elements as set forth in amended independent claims 1 and 9 are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record, including

Masazumi, Gyoda and Hashimoto.

As shown in the previous Reply, Gyoda fails to teach moving a substrate. Similarly, Hashimoto fails to teach a moving substrate. Masazumi however, appears to disclose a base which may be fixed or moved.

However, Masazumi does not teach or suggest combinations of elements including adjusting an on-off of a voltage according to a position of the moving substrate as recited in independent claim 1, as amended or an on-off of a voltage according to said apparatus is adjusted according to a position of the moving substrate, as recited in independent claim 9, as amended.

In addition, claims 2, 4-8, 10 and 12-14 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 9, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claims 1 and 9, which are believed to be allowable.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-14 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Percy L. Square, Registration No. 51,084 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By  #41,458

James T. Eller, Jr.

Reg. No. 39,538

P. O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000


JTE/PLS/mlr:jls